

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board

Paper No. 21

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DERK J. ADELERHOF,
RONALD DEKKER,
and
HENRICUS G.R. MAAS

Appeal No. 2000-2181
Application No. 08/966,229

ON BRIEF

Before HAIRSTON, FLEMING, and LEVY, Administrative Patent Judges.
HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 4 and 11 through 20. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The disclosed invention relates to a thin-film magnetic head having a magnetic layer structure arranged on one of two parallel sides of a semiconductor substrate, and an integrated circuit

Appeal No. 2000-2181
Application No. 08/966,229

formed on the other of the two parallel sides of the semiconductor substrate.

Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

1. A thin-film magnetic head having a head face and a magnetic layer structure which is arranged on one of two parallel sides of a semiconductor substrate, wherein the semiconductor substrate is provided with an integrated circuit, characterized in that the semiconductor substrate is secured to a carrier body by means of a securing layer between the other of said two parallel sides and the carrier body.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Daughenbaugh et al. (Daughenbaugh)	4,317,147	Feb. 23, 1982
Lazzari	4,809,103	Feb. 28, 1989
Lin et al. (Lin)	5,506,737	Apr. 9, 1996
Zieren et al. (Zieren)	5,513,057	Apr. 30, 1996
Sundaram	5,710,683	Jan. 20, 1998
		(filed Apr. 18, 1996)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11 through 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Sundaram.

Claims 2 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Sundaram and Lazzari.

Claims 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Daughenbaugh.

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Daughenbaugh and Lazzari.

Appeal No. 2000-2181
Application No. 08/966,229

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Sundaram and Zieren.

Reference is made to the briefs (paper numbers 15 and 19) and the answer (paper number 17) for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

At the outset, we note that the appellants have not chosen to argue the merits of the examiner's rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 14, 17 and 18 (brief, pages 5 and 12). Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of these claims is sustained pro forma.

The obviousness rejection of claims 12, 13 and 16 is reversed because the applied references neither teach nor would have suggested the specifically claimed thicknesses of the semiconductor substrate.

Turning to the obviousness rejection of claims 2, 15 and 20, we agree with the appellants (brief, pages 7 and 8) that the top layer 48 and the bottom layer 35 in Sundaram are not securing layers as stated by the examiner (answer, page 4). Thus, in spite of Lazzari's disclosure of an integrated circuit 12 on an opposite side of the substrate 10 from magnetic head 11, the combined teachings of the references as proposed by the examiner (answer, pages 4, 7 and 8) would still lack the securing layer of

claims 2 and 20. With respect to claim 15, appellants acknowledge (brief, page 12) that the additional reference to Daughenbaugh discloses "securing layers, and clearly has both a carrier body and a support body," but argue (brief, page 12) that such structure is not arranged in the manner set forth in these claims. We agree. Thus, the obviousness rejection of claims 2, 15 and 20 is reversed.

The obviousness rejection of claim 19 is reversed because Zieren discloses (Figure 3) a wear-resistant layer 31 over the head face and the substrate as opposed to "between" the substrate and the head face.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 4 and 11 through 20 is affirmed as to claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 14, 17 and 18, and is reversed as to claims 2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 20. Accordingly, the decision of the examiner is affirmed-in-part.

Appeal No. 2000-2181
Application No. 08/966,229

No time period for taking any subsequent action in
connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR
§ 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED-IN-PART

KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	
MICHAEL R. FLEMING)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
)	
STUART S. LEVY)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

KWH:hh

Appeal No. 2000-2181
Application No. 08/966,229

U.S. PHILIPS CORP.
580 WHITE PLAINS RD.
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591